

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HUMANITARIAN AID—CHIAPAS,
MEXICO

HON. SAM JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1997

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as our relationship with Mexico becomes more and more important to the economic well-being of our Nation, I would like to bring to this body's attention the sacrificial effort of 48 young men, who at their own expense and under the invitation and direction of Gov. Julio Cesar Ruiz Ferro and Senator Pablo Salazar, have served the community of Nuevo San Miguel Micotic in the Chiapas region of Mexico. During the summer of 1996 as part of Operation Eagle 96-2, 96-3, and 96-4, they provided medical aid and construction assistance, met basic needs, and taught skills to better the community's living conditions and ability to benefit neighboring communities. Their work continues to be heralded throughout the state of Chiapas among the citizens and leaders of Mexico. Furthermore, their experience of cross-cultural service not only strengthens global relationships, but better equips them for work in their home communities.

LISTING OF STUDENTS AND (STATES)

Daniel Alexander (AK), Ryan Batterton (WA), Joel Beaird (TX), David Beskow (OR), Brian Biddle (OH), Daniel Boyd (TX), Philip Codington (SC), Steve Dankers (WI), Thomas Exstrum (AB), Andrew Farley (CA), Steve Farrand (CO), Scott Forrester (TN).

Joel George (CO), Joshua Gilbert (WA), Timothy Hammeke (KS), Avione Heaps (MT), William Hicks (CA), Cody Horner (MD), Zachary Jaeger (IA), Hans Jensen (CA), Joshua Knaak (AB), David Kress (AL), Daniel Lamb (CA), Kristofer Lee (OR).

Paul Lee (TX), Andrew Leonhard (VA), Andrew Lundberg (WA), Stephen Lundberg (WA), Jason Mallow (GA), Andrew Monsbor (MI), Larry Mooney (OH), James Penner (OH), Daniel Powell (AL), Daniel Reynolds (MN), Gregg Rozeboom (MI), Chad Sikora (MI).

Kevin Staples (AB), Daniel Straban (IN), Nathanael Swanson (NB), Leon King Tan (Malaysia), David Thomas (MI), Roy Van Cleve (WA), Ariel Vanderhost (KS), Christopher Veenstra (MI), Jason Wenk (NY), Reese Wihite (TX), Nathan Williams (KS), Joshua Wright (AR).

WEI JINGSHENG

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 13, 1997

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlemen from California, Congressman COX and Congressman LANTOS, for arranging for this Special Order today.

Wei Jingsheng is a brave, articulate, and nonviolent fighter for democracy. He is a hero

who one day we hope will be officially leading China. But today he is someone who struggles just to stay alive during his second 14-year prison sentence. He is sick. He has lost all of his teeth. And yet he still displays incredible courage.

Soon after the Tiannanmen Square massacre, in an incredible display of courage, Wei Jingsheng wrote to Deng Xiaoping stating:

So, now that you've successfully carried out a military coup to deal with a group of unarmed and politically inexperienced students and citizens, how do you feel? * * * I've long known that you are precisely the kind of idiot to do something foolish like this, just as you've long known that I am precisely the kind of idiot who will remain stubborn to the end and take blows with his head up. We know each other well; probably better than anyone can imagine. It's just that we have an intimate mutual disgust that probably also exceeds anyone's imagination.

During the fall of 1992, Wei wrote a document titled, "A Open Letter to Deng Xiaoping, The Director of the Tragedy of Tibet." In it he spoke of Deng's discrimination—or racism—against the Tibetans. And years before the current Panchen Lama was kidnaped by Deng's government, Wei wrote to Deng saying:

* * * the Chinese government should do away with the traditional policy of detaining Tibetan religious leaders as hostages * * * The Chinese government should eliminate the mentality of the so-called "great Han empire. * * * It was your one-sided propaganda that has resulted in this national discrimination against Tibetans * * * No matter what excuses you give the Tibetan People, they are not as stupid as you think. They know that you are not sincere in helping them so that they would not trust you.

Now that Deng is gone the Chinese Government has an opportunity to set things straight with the democracy movement in China and the Tibetan people.

We hope that the Chinese leaders read his letters and join the civilized world by releasing Wei and permitting the reforms that he calls for.

I ask that the full text of his open letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

OPEN LETTER TO DENG XIAOPING, THE DIRECTOR OF THE TRAGEDY OF TIBET—OCTOBER 5, 1992

MR. DENG XIAOPING: I personally know only a little about Tibetan history. However, I believe that I am more clear-minded than you and your people. Therefore, I venture to write this letter to you and hope that you would create an academic atmosphere of free expression, so that people of knowledge could put forward more insight with regard to this issue and find out the problem. Only by doing so, could we avoid losing the last opportunity of settling the issue and avoid repeating the situation of the former Soviet Union and Yugoslavia.

The director of this tragedy is no other than you, Mr. Deng Xiaoping. As early as in the 1940s, the rulers of Tibet started the discussion of social reform in Tibet. What they wanted was a social system like that in Britain or India and moderate reform based on

religious values. In accordance with custom over several thousand years, they wanted to carry out the reform by themselves. They did not like the idea of being reformed by foreigners or foreigner-like Han people (KMT managed to respect this tradition so that relations between KMT and Tibet were more harmonious).

During the early 1950s, the Chinese Communist Party was at its height. Like all other communist parties, it had little respect for sovereignty and national self-determination. Meanwhile, India, which just gained independence from British rule, could hardly afford to help Tibet in its struggle against the Chinese Communist Party. Therefore, the effort to refuse entry of the communists into Tibet ended in failure. Moreover, the ignorance of the young Dalai Lama and the corruption of the Tibetan bureaucracy were the major factors for the communist troops' smooth occupation of Lhasa.

Regretfully, the leaders of the Chinese Communist Party, Mao Zedong and yourself included, became big-headed with the "victory" of the Korea War and the recovery of the economy. At the same time when you carried out the "big leap forward" and ultra-leftist policies in the mainland, you began to implement leftist policies in Tibet by deciding to accelerate the democratic reform in Tibet. During the war and for a long while afterward, the mutual discrimination and contempt between the Tibetans and the Chinese added to the hatred which caused the killing of innocent people by the army, and torture by officials. The estrangement between the peoples deepened and the national struggle for independence escalated. The situation and pattern of confrontation between the two sides was just like that between the colonial powers and the colonies in the old days. It was also like the situation in today's Yugoslavia.

The societies that have already divided or are in the process of division are those that over-emphasize a limitless administrative power of one nation over other nations. The toughest obstacle facing the societies that have already achieved unity or in the process of achieving it is also the over-emphasis of sovereignty. The advantage of unity is obvious and the arguments against unity are also strong. Why should people put emphasis only on the arguments against unity? Can you find a case to show that unity could be maintained only by high pressure? Even if you could find one, it must be because the time for division has not come yet. You have all along advocated anti-colonialism and national independence. In fact, you do not understand what anti-colonialism and national independence are. You have only taken it as a convenient tool. This is precisely the root cause of your leftism.

Up until 1949, China had never oppressed Tibet nor had it forced Tibet to be a subject to China. The two sides had achieved sovereign unity voluntarily. Even today, chances of unity between China and Tibet are much better than that within the Commonwealth of Independent States and the European Community. In the early days of his forced exile, the Dalai Lama did not demand independence. Nor is he demanding it today. This shows there exists a very good chance of unity. However, you have adhered to the old ideas and policies and continued to

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.